Global Treasury Dump: Simulating the Macroeconomic Fallout of a $9 Trillion Foreign Divestment from U.S. Debt

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

January 31, 2026

The United States Treasury market is often regarded as the safest, most liquid, and most systemically critical asset class in the global economy. Foreign governments, central banks, and institutional investors collectively hold over $9 trillion in U.S. Treasuries—roughly one-third of publicly held American federal debt. This foreign ownership has historically functioned as a stabilizing force, absorbing U.S. deficits and recycling global trade surpluses. But what if that stabilizer became a trigger? This paper explores a high-stakes scenario in which all foreign holders simultaneously liquidate their U.S. Treasury positions. The simulation outlines likely consequences across interest rates, currency markets, central bank behavior, and global capital flows. By analyzing the delicate balance of sovereign trust, liquidity preference, and macroeconomic feedback loops, we expose how such a coordinated or accidental sell-off could shock not only U.S. financial systems but ripple through global economies. This "debt dump" thought experiment highlights the fragility of the current debt ecosystem, illustrating that weaponizing financial interdependence can lead to mutually assured disruption. The scenario serves as a strategic warning and an opportunity to rethink the resilience and decentralization of the global financial order.

Keywords: U.S. Treasuries, foreign holdings, debt crisis, macroeconomic simulation, interest rates, dollar collapse, China, Japan, Federal Reserve, global capital markets, reserve currencies, monetary policy, liquidity crisis, financial weaponization.

A collaboration with GPT-4o and GPT-5.2-Thinking. CC4.0.

1. Introduction

The global financial system is anchored by a handful of institutions, currencies, and instruments that function as pillars of stability, liquidity, and trust. Chief among them is the market for U.S. Treasury securities. These instruments are not merely a tool of American fiscal policy; they are a foundation for global finance. Treasuries serve as the benchmark for risk-free returns, the primary collateral in interbank lending markets, and the most commonly held foreign exchange reserve assets by central banks. Their price movements ripple outward through every corner of the financial world—from sovereign debt in emerging markets to the interest rates paid by American homeowners. In this context, the continued foreign appetite for Treasuries has enabled the United States to finance its deficits on favorable terms, even as debt levels rise.

But what happens when that demand falters—or reverses? A coordinated or accidental mass divestment of U.S. Treasuries by foreign entities could function as a systemic shock. This paper initiates a structured thought experiment around that possibility, quantifying potential consequences and tracing likely feedback loops across macroeconomic and geopolitical domains.

1.1 The Centrality of U.S. Treasuries in Global Finance

U.S. Treasury securities are widely regarded as the safest and most liquid financial assets in the world. Their global role stems from three key characteristics: the perceived political and institutional stability of the U.S. government, the depth and transparency of the Treasury market, and the dollar's dominance in global trade and finance.

Treasuries function as a reserve asset for central banks, a store of value for sovereign wealth funds, and a key source of yield for institutional investors. They are used as collateral in derivatives and repo markets, embedded in risk models, and referenced as the risk-free rate in asset pricing. During periods of crisis, Treasuries experience inflows as investors flee to safety. In stable times, they facilitate global recycling of capital—from surplus nations like Japan or Germany into deficit-financed consumption and investment in the United States.

The liquidity of the Treasury market also enables it to absorb large volumes of trading with minimal impact on prices—at least under normal conditions. In this way, Treasuries are more than a debt instrument; they are the monetary infrastructure of the global system. Their collapse, or even impairment, would send tremors through every interconnected layer of finance.

1.2 Foreign Ownership: Structure, Scale, and Importance

Foreign ownership of U.S. Treasuries is both vast and diverse. As of late 2025, foreign entities held over $9.3 trillion in Treasuries, accounting for more than 30% of all publicly held U.S. debt. These holdings are distributed among dozens of countries, with the largest stakes held by Japan, China, the United Kingdom, and several offshore financial centers like Luxembourg and the Cayman Islands.

The nature of this ownership is mixed: central banks hold Treasuries as foreign exchange reserves; sovereign wealth funds seek safe, stable returns; and global financial institutions use them for liquidity management. The custodial structure can obscure beneficial ownership, as many assets are held through third-party brokers in neutral jurisdictions.

This massive foreign position has supported the U.S. government's ability to borrow at low rates and expand its fiscal footprint. It has also created a form of mutual dependence: while the U.S. benefits from external financing, foreign holders rely on the safety, convertibility, and marketability of these securities. This interdependence is usually seen as stabilizing. But it also introduces risk—if the bond between issuer and holder weakens.

1.3 Why Simulate a Global Treasury Dump?

Though the probability of all foreign holders simultaneously dumping U.S. Treasuries is low, the magnitude of such a scenario demands serious analytical attention. This is a textbook example of a low-probability, high-impact event—a financial "black swan" that, if realized, could trigger cascading failures.

There are several reasons to simulate such a scenario. First, it illuminates hidden vulnerabilities in the global financial architecture, particularly in how centralized and interdependent reserve systems have become. Second, it provides insight into how interest rates, currency values, central bank actions, and capital flows might respond under extreme pressure. Third, it allows policymakers to preemptively identify tools and strategies that could be deployed in response—such as quantitative easing, capital controls, or debt restructuring protocols.

Finally, the simulation also serves as a geopolitical caution. In a world of rising multipolar tensions, financial instruments can become strategic weapons. If a group of nations chose to coordinate divestment as a form of economic coercion, the results could be indistinguishable from a financial war. Modeling this possibility—regardless of its likelihood—is essential for stress-testing the resilience of the current global order.

2. Anatomy of Foreign Holdings

Understanding the composition and structure of foreign ownership of U.S. Treasuries is essential for grasping both the strengths and vulnerabilities of the global financial system. The U.S. Treasury publishes monthly data under the Treasury International Capital (TIC) system, which provides detailed breakdowns by country and classification. However, this data reveals more complexity than it resolves. The holdings are diverse not only in geographical distribution but also in institutional type—ranging from foreign central banks and sovereign wealth funds to private banks, insurance companies, and asset managers. Complicating matters further is the rise of offshore financial centers, which obscure the line between custodianship and beneficial ownership. These layers must be examined carefully to simulate and interpret a large-scale liquidation scenario accurately.

2.1 Breakdown by Country and Institution

As of late 2025, foreign holdings of U.S. Treasuries exceeded $9.3 trillion, constituting over 30% of the publicly held U.S. national debt. Japan remains the largest single foreign holder, with approximately $1.2 trillion in Treasuries. China follows, though its holdings have declined in recent years, now sitting just below $700 billion. Other significant holders include the United Kingdom, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Switzerland. These figures reflect a combination of sovereign and private investment activity.

On the institutional side, foreign central banks and monetary authorities typically hold Treasuries as part of their foreign exchange reserve portfolios. These “official holdings” are usually long-term in nature, driven by trade surpluses and currency management strategies. Private institutional holders, including global asset managers, hedge funds, and insurance companies, also play a large role. These actors respond more dynamically to interest rate differentials, geopolitical risk, and relative returns, and are thus more sensitive to shocks and policy shifts.

Interestingly, the TIC reports do not fully distinguish between these two categories in all cases. However, more detailed disaggregations show that roughly two-thirds of foreign holdings are by official institutions, while the remaining third is held by private sector actors. This composition matters because central banks are more politically constrained in their actions, while private institutions can liquidate quickly in response to market signals.

2.2 Role of Offshore Financial Centers

A striking feature of the foreign holdings data is the prominence of small jurisdictions with disproportionately large Treasury positions. For example, the Cayman Islands, Luxembourg, and Ireland together hold hundreds of billions of dollars in U.S. Treasuries—far exceeding the size of their domestic economies. These countries act as offshore financial centers and custodial hubs, not necessarily as ultimate owners.

These centers serve several roles: they house global investment vehicles such as mutual funds, hedge funds, and special-purpose entities; they offer tax advantages and legal simplicity; and they act as routing stations for capital flows originating in third-party countries. For instance, Chinese entities may hold U.S. securities through intermediaries in Hong Kong or the Cayman Islands, complicating the picture of direct exposure.

From a simulation standpoint, the prominence of these centers introduces substantial opacity. While headline data might suggest that a particular jurisdiction is a major seller, the economic motivation and geopolitical consequences actually reside elsewhere. Therefore, treating these holdings as fungible across borders during a debt-dump scenario may misrepresent the timing, coordination, and intent of real-world liquidation.

2.3 Custodial Attribution vs Beneficial Ownership

The U.S. Treasury's TIC data is based on custodial location, not beneficial ownership. This means that securities held in trust or by intermediary financial institutions are attributed to the country where the custodian resides—not necessarily where the ultimate owner or decision-maker is located. For example, if a Saudi sovereign wealth fund holds Treasuries via a European bank in Luxembourg, those assets will appear under Luxembourg in the TIC tables.

This system has practical advantages: it reflects the legal structure of asset custody and enables consistent tracking of cross-border capital flows. However, it severely limits analytical clarity in times of stress. In a rapid divestment scenario, policymakers may misjudge the origin of selling pressure, or fail to see coordinated moves emerging behind a web of intermediaries.

From a simulation perspective, this distinction is crucial. A true systemic risk model would require tracing beneficial ownership back through the custody chain, identifying not just where the assets are held, but who ultimately controls them. It would also need to distinguish between passive holders and politically motivated actors, as the former may sell for yield reasons while the latter may act strategically.

Understanding this distinction also highlights the challenge of forecasting market behavior under stress. Sudden shifts in confidence could trigger liquidation not from central banks, but

from global funds housed in custodial hotbeds. Therefore, any simulation that treats country-level data as a proxy for sovereign intent must be handled with caution and qualified by institutional context.

3. The Simulation Scenario

To understand the implications of a global Treasury divestment event, we construct a simulation grounded in realistic financial mechanics but intentionally stress-tested beyond historical precedent. The goal is not to predict the future, but to expose systemic vulnerabilities, feedback loops, and policy response gaps. This scenario assumes the full liquidation of all foreign-held U.S. Treasury securities—totaling approximately $9.355 trillion as of late 2025—over a specified time horizon. While unlikely in probability, the scenario is highly consequential in impact, qualifying as a "fat tail" risk deserving close scrutiny.

Simulating both gradual and sudden liquidation paths reveals distinct pathways to market disruption. Moreover, exploring whether such divestment is coordinated or merely coincidental in origin allows us to separate intentional financial warfare from systemic panic. This layered approach provides analytical clarity for both policymakers and market participants.

3.1 Assumptions: Total Liquidation of $9.355T

The simulation begins with the assumption that the entire $9.355 trillion in U.S. Treasuries held by foreign entities is sold into the global market. This includes both sovereign (official) and private holdings, with no differentiation in selloff behavior. The liquidation occurs without U.S. capital controls, legal prohibitions, or retaliatory trade barriers—assumptions made to isolate financial variables from geopolitical escalation scenarios.

We assume that the sales occur through existing secondary markets, not through redemption at maturity. In other words, these assets are sold at prevailing market prices, potentially with significant discounts if supply overwhelms demand. No artificial price floors are assumed, and the Federal Reserve is not initially engaged in absorbing this excess—though later sections model the Fed’s possible responses.

We also assume that sellers attempt to convert proceeds from dollars into their own currencies or alternative reserve assets such as euros, gold, or special drawing rights (SDRs), thereby creating both bond market and foreign exchange market stress. Finally, we assume that capital markets react rationally but with elevated volatility, as liquidity dries up and expectations deteriorate.

3.2 Timeline: One-Year vs Sudden Dump

The timeline of liquidation dramatically affects the market's ability to absorb the shock. We model two distinct variants:

Gradual Selloff (One-Year Horizon):
In this version, foreign holders evenly distribute their liquidation over 12 months, averaging roughly $780 billion in Treasury sales per month. While this would still apply enormous pressure on yields, markets might adapt incrementally. The Federal Reserve could respond with targeted interventions, and private demand might partially fill the void if interest rates rise fast enough to attract yield-seeking investors. Even so, the extended nature of the dump risks a rolling crisis: each month's selloff could reprice rates, devalue portfolios, and destabilize expectations anew.

Sudden Shock (One-Week Event):
In the acute scenario, a geopolitical or market shock triggers the full liquidation within a compressed window—say, 5 to 10 trading days. The sheer size of a $9 trillion dump overwhelms buyers. Treasury prices collapse, yields spike precipitously, and panic spreads through repo markets, risk models, and currency exchanges. The Federal Reserve is likely forced into emergency quantitative easing or outright yield curve control, injecting trillions in liquidity. The shock would mirror, and potentially exceed, the dislocations seen during the 2008 financial crisis or the 2020 COVID-19 liquidity crunch.

3.3 Coordination vs Coincidence: Causes and Plausibility

The third critical dimension of the simulation is whether the global Treasury dump is coordinated or coincidental. The distinction is not academic—it alters the motive structure, predictability, and international responses.

Coordinated Dump (Strategic Financial Warfare):
Here, one or more countries—possibly led by a geopolitical rival such as China or Russia—organize a financial campaign to destabilize the U.S. economy by offloading Treasuries en masse. This could follow a military escalation, sanctions regime, or a breakdown in diplomatic relations. Other aligned countries might join the effort, either ideologically or out of fear of U.S. retaliation. The coordinated nature of the dump would raise alarms across intelligence agencies and global institutions, triggering countermeasures ranging from capital controls to diplomatic isolation.

Coincidental Panic (Systemic Flight):
Alternatively, the liquidation may occur without any centralized intent. A loss of confidence in U.S. fiscal sustainability, a credit downgrade, or a surprise inflation spike could induce multiple

independent actors to sell Treasuries defensively. This decentralized behavior would look like contagion: each seller moves to pre-empt losses, triggering others to follow. The result is the same—rapid liquidation—but the underlying cause is market psychology, not geopolitics. In this case, the Federal Reserve and Treasury might have more latitude to intervene without escalating into a political confrontation.

Hybrid Scenario:
In reality, these forces may mix. A politically motivated exit by a major holder could trigger market panic among neutral actors. Conversely, a spontaneous flight to safety could be interpreted as an attack, amplifying diplomatic tension. For simulation purposes, we treat these scenarios as boundary cases—coordinated and coincidental—so that policy responses can be tested across a spectrum of causes.

Ultimately, this tripartite framing—amount, timeline, and intent—forms the backbone of the simulation, allowing us to explore not just what happens, but *why* it happens and *how* it might be stopped or mitigated.

4. Shock Transmission: U.S. Interest Rates

The most immediate and forceful transmission mechanism of a global Treasury dump would manifest through the U.S. interest rate structure. U.S. Treasuries are the benchmark securities from which virtually all other interest rates in the economy derive, from mortgage rates and student loans to municipal bonds and corporate debt. If foreign holders collectively offload more than $9 trillion of Treasuries into the secondary market, the resulting oversupply would sharply disrupt pricing, liquidity, and investor confidence. The market's ability to absorb such volume without violent re-pricing is questionable. This section explores how that supply shock would propagate into rising yields, higher government borrowing costs, and crowding out of private capital.

4.1 Supply Surge and Secondary Market Disruption

Under normal conditions, the U.S. Treasury market is deep and liquid, handling trillions of dollars in transactions per week. However, it is still a market—meaning prices respond to supply and demand. A sudden surge in selling from foreign holders would constitute an extraordinary spike in supply, particularly in the secondary market where most Treasury trading occurs. Because these sales would not be tied to new issuance but rather to liquidation of existing bonds, the official debt ceiling or auction schedule would not adjust to absorb the change.

In such a scenario, price discovery would break down as liquidity evaporates. Dealers, overwhelmed by volume and constrained by capital requirements, would be unable or unwilling to make orderly markets. Bid-ask spreads would widen sharply. Even long-duration U.S. Treasuries—typically a haven of stability—would become volatile. Large asset managers would be forced to mark down their holdings, triggering redemptions, margin calls, and risk aversion that ripples through the financial system.

The effect would not be confined to Treasury traders. Because Treasuries are used as collateral in repo markets and derivatives contracts, the price decline would erode collateral quality across the financial system. This erosion would create a "collateral crunch" that could spread even faster than the selloff itself, as liquidity is drained from essential short-term funding markets.

4.2 Estimates of Yield Increases

Estimating the magnitude of the yield spike depends on the pace and structure of the liquidation. A series of empirical models and past episodes suggest that large sales of Treasuries can materially impact interest rates even when markets are functioning normally. For example, the Federal Reserve's tapering announcements in 2013 increased 10-year yields by roughly 100 basis points over a few months, despite no immediate change in asset flows.

In our scenario, a gradual $9.355 trillion divestment over a year could push yields up by **150 to** 250 basis points (1.5% to 2.5%), assuming partial absorption by domestic investors and some offsetting Federal Reserve action. A more concentrated selloff over weeks could cause yields to spike 300 basis points or more in the short term, before emergency intervention stabilizes markets.

These numbers matter. A 10-year Treasury yield rising from 4% to 7% would dramatically increase borrowing costs for households, businesses, and the federal government itself. The cost of capital would rise across the board. Refinancing activity would collapse. The equity risk premium would widen, leading to equity market drawdowns. Real estate, corporate debt issuance, and consumer credit markets would all feel tightening pressure, amplifying economic contraction.

4.3 Crowding Out Private Borrowers and Rising Deficit Costs

As yields rise to attract new buyers for excess supply, private borrowers would be squeezed out of the credit system. This phenomenon, known as "crowding out," occurs when government borrowing consumes the available capital pool, leaving less room for households and firms.

Banks and institutional investors would redirect portfolios toward higher-yielding Treasuries, reducing appetite for corporate or municipal debt. This effect would be particularly acute for small businesses and municipalities with weaker credit ratings, who cannot compete with the risk-free return offered by surging Treasuries.

The U.S. government would also face escalating fiscal strain. With more than $30 trillion in publicly held debt and regular refinancing needs, a sharp increase in Treasury yields would translate into hundreds of billions in additional annual interest expense. These rising costs would consume a growing share of federal revenue, forcing politically difficult tradeoffs between entitlement programs, defense spending, and discretionary investment. If the market begins to doubt the government's ability to stabilize its finances, a feedback loop could emerge—higher rates driving larger deficits, which in turn drive higher rates.

In a prolonged version of this scenario, deficit interest costs could exceed military or healthcare spending, shifting the structure of the federal budget and constraining future policy flexibility. A Treasury dump, therefore, is not just a market event—it is a fiscal weapon with deep implications for U.S. economic sovereignty.

5. Shock Transmission: U.S. Dollar Volatility

A global liquidation of U.S. Treasuries would trigger far-reaching effects beyond interest rates and financial markets—it would also profoundly destabilize the global foreign exchange system, with the U.S. dollar at the center. The dollar is the dominant global reserve currency, accounting for over half of all cross-border transactions and central bank holdings. Since Treasuries are dollar-denominated, any coordinated or mass divestment not only affects U.S. debt markets but also creates enormous volatility in currency exchange flows. The dollar's role as both a safe haven and a target of divestment creates paradoxical dynamics, where capital may simultaneously flee and flood into the dollar depending on the nature of the crisis. This section examines the specific transmission channels that would affect the dollar's valuation and, by extension, trade balances, inflationary pressures, and domestic purchasing power.

5.1 Currency Conversion Pressure

Foreign holders of U.S. Treasuries, upon selling their securities, would typically seek to convert the proceeds from U.S. dollars into their local or preferred reserve currencies. This would place downward pressure on the dollar in global foreign exchange markets. A large-scale shift from dollars into yuan, euros, yen, or gold would require significant FX transactions, exacerbating volatility and stressing liquidity in currency markets.

The effect would be especially pronounced if central banks engaged in these conversions directly to realign reserve compositions. As tens or hundreds of billions of dollars are sold and exchanged, demand for alternative currencies would surge while demand for the dollar would fall. This imbalance could cause the dollar to depreciate sharply relative to major currencies. In addition, expectations of further depreciation could trigger speculative short-selling of the dollar, amplifying the downward movement through self-reinforcing cycles.

However, the dollar's ubiquity means that liquidity constraints may prevent a clean or orderly exit. Many foreign institutions would be forced to conduct their transactions through multiple intermediaries or over extended periods, diluting the impact of their conversion but still leaving behind heightened volatility and transactional uncertainty.

5.2 Safe-Haven Paradox and Conflicting Flows

Despite the logical expectation that a global selloff of U.S. assets would weaken the dollar, historical crises reveal a persistent paradox: the dollar often strengthens during global turmoil. This "safe-haven paradox" is rooted in the structural reality that during crises, global investors flee to the most liquid and universally accepted stores of value—still overwhelmingly U.S. dollars and Treasuries.

In a debt-dump scenario, some capital would indeed be exiting the dollar as foreign holders attempt to reduce exposure. But simultaneously, risk-averse capital—especially from private sector institutions—could flood into the U.S. dollar and short-duration Treasury instruments seeking relative safety. The result could be a bifurcated market, where volatility drives chaotic swings rather than unidirectional collapse.

Currency traders and macro hedge funds would be caught between narratives: is this an unwinding of dollar supremacy, or a panic-induced scramble for liquidity? These conflicting signals would produce extreme volatility in foreign exchange markets. Short-term dollar appreciation might give way to medium-term depreciation as structural pressures take over and new equilibrium expectations settle in.

In effect, the dollar could surge in the early days of the crisis, only to fall sharply later once monetary responses and inflation expectations begin to register.

5.3 Effects on Trade, Inflation, and Purchasing Power

Exchange rate shifts do not exist in isolation—they ripple into the real economy through trade flows, import prices, and inflation dynamics. If the dollar depreciates significantly as a result of

the Treasury selloff, U.S. imports would become more expensive. This would raise the price of consumer goods, especially those sourced from Asia and Europe, contributing to a new wave of imported inflation. For a country with a large trade deficit, this effect could be substantial.

On the export side, a weaker dollar would theoretically make U.S. goods more competitive abroad. However, this benefit may be neutralized by global economic instability, reduced foreign demand, and rising domestic production costs driven by inflation and higher borrowing costs. Thus, the traditional gain from devaluation may be muted or delayed.

For American consumers and businesses, the most immediate effect would be a decline in purchasing power. Essential goods, energy, and raw materials would cost more in dollar terms. Households would feel the pinch through higher prices at the pump, at the grocery store, and in everyday imported goods. For lower-income populations and fixed-income retirees, this could represent a severe erosion of living standards.

Additionally, expectations of sustained dollar weakness may lead foreign suppliers to raise prices preemptively, building a self-reinforcing inflationary spiral. Domestically, the Federal Reserve would face a policy trap: raising interest rates to defend the dollar and tame inflation could worsen the economic contraction, while monetary easing to support growth might further weaken the currency.

In total, dollar volatility—whether up, down, or both—would amplify the chaos of a Treasury dump. It would scramble global portfolios, test monetary credibility, and threaten the dollar's status as a stable international benchmark. While unlikely to displace the dollar entirely, such a shock could accelerate the long-term search for alternatives among rival currency blocs and multilateral institutions.

6. The Federal Reserve's Strategic Dilemma

In the face of a $9.355 trillion foreign Treasury liquidation, the Federal Reserve stands as the last line of defense for the U.S. financial system. Its core mandates—maintaining price stability, maximizing employment, and ensuring financial stability—would come into direct conflict. If the Fed fails to act, interest rates could spike uncontrollably, collapsing private credit markets and triggering a deep recession. If it intervenes aggressively, it risks igniting inflation, undermining credibility, and provoking political outrage. The central bank's challenge becomes not only economic, but existential. How it responds to a global Treasury dump would define the limits of its power and the future of the dollar-based financial system.

6.1 Absorbing the Dump: QE at Scale

One of the most direct tools available to the Federal Reserve is the expansion of its balance sheet through large-scale asset purchases—commonly known as quantitative easing (QE). In the 2008 financial crisis and again in 2020, the Fed used QE to stabilize markets by buying Treasuries and mortgage-backed securities, injecting liquidity and suppressing yields. In this scenario, a massive Treasury selloff would force the Fed to consider QE on an unprecedented scale—potentially absorbing trillions of dollars' worth of dumped securities in a matter of weeks or months.

Such action could stabilize yields in the short term by creating artificial demand, reducing market panic, and signaling institutional resolve. But the consequences would be immense. The Fed's balance sheet, already elevated from past interventions, could expand well beyond $13 trillion, pushing it into uncharted territory. This raises questions about the long-term impact on inflation expectations, monetary discipline, and the political independence of the central bank. In essence, the Fed would be attempting to nationalize a significant portion of the U.S. debt market in real time.

This strategy also requires operational speed and decisiveness. A fragmented or delayed response could allow yields to spike before the Fed's actions take effect, defeating the purpose of intervention. Moreover, large-scale purchases would need to be maintained over time to prevent subsequent waves of selling from reigniting the crisis. QE at this scale becomes not just a crisis tool, but a sustained posture—an unprecedented shift in the structure of U.S. monetary operations.

6.2 Risks of Inflation, Moral Hazard, and Political Backlash

The most obvious risk of massive QE is inflation. Flooding the market with trillions in liquidity during a period of rising global prices and falling confidence in dollar assets could undermine the Fed's inflation-fighting credibility. If sellers convert their proceeds into commodities, gold, or non-dollar currencies, this could amplify inflationary pressure through both domestic price levels and exchange rate effects. Inflation expectations, once unanchored, are notoriously difficult to rein in without severe tightening later.

In addition, the Fed would face accusations of moral hazard. By stepping in to absorb foreign liquidation, it would effectively be protecting other nations' portfolio decisions at the expense of American savers and taxpayers. This could set a dangerous precedent: foreign governments may assume that the U.S. will always backstop its own market, regardless of who triggers the shock. This undermines incentives for global reserve discipline and encourages speculative positioning by large holders of U.S. debt.

Politically, such intervention would be radioactive. Critics would decry it as a bailout of foreign powers, a distortion of free markets, or an undemocratic expansion of central bank power. Congress could retaliate with legislative constraints, audits, or threats to the Fed's independence. The fragile consensus that underpins central bank autonomy could fracture, turning the monetary response into a political battleground. In such an environment, even effective policy may be unsustainable.

6.3 Yield Curve Control vs Currency Defense

Faced with rapidly rising yields, the Federal Reserve might also consider a more aggressive approach: yield curve control (YCC). Under YCC, the central bank targets specific interest rates across maturities and commits to buying whatever volume of securities is necessary to maintain those targets. This tool was used by the Bank of Japan and briefly by the Fed during the 1940s. In theory, it allows the Fed to anchor borrowing costs regardless of market conditions.

However, yield curve control comes with its own trade-offs. If the Fed caps yields in the face of massive selling, it must purchase virtually unlimited quantities of Treasuries, inviting inflation and balance sheet expansion. If it refuses to cap yields, borrowing costs for the government and private sector could rise uncontrollably. Worse, if YCC is perceived as a permanent policy shift, it could destroy market discipline entirely, leading to capital flight from dollar-denominated assets.

Meanwhile, defending the dollar itself may require a contradictory policy response. If the dollar collapses during the Treasury dump, the Fed may need to raise interest rates sharply to defend the currency's value and contain imported inflation. But this action would directly oppose YCC and undermine bond price stability. The Fed would be trapped between defending the bond market and defending the currency—unable to do both simultaneously without creating unacceptable trade-offs.

In the most extreme case, the Fed could be forced to choose between preserving the dollar's global role and maintaining the solvency of the U.S. fiscal state. If these priorities diverge, no amount of technocratic finesse can avoid the political and economic rupture that follows. The simulation thus reveals not only a market crisis, but a moment of structural reckoning for American monetary hegemony.

7. Foreign Sellers' Dilemma

While a coordinated or spontaneous divestment from U.S. Treasuries may appear to offer financial or geopolitical leverage, foreign holders face a profound dilemma of their own. The

decision to liquidate U.S. government bonds en masse does not occur in a vacuum. It carries risks that reverberate through their own financial systems, currencies, and international reputations. For many sovereign and institutional holders, U.S. Treasuries represent not only an investment vehicle but a cornerstone of global reserve architecture and domestic economic stability. Divestment, particularly at scale, is thus an act of self-inflicted uncertainty. This section explores the strategic and economic constraints that make such a move deeply problematic for the would-be sellers themselves.

7.1 Loss of Liquidity and Reserve Credibility

U.S. Treasuries are not just safe assets—they are the *most* liquid securities in the world. They are universally accepted as collateral, priced in deep markets, and supported by the infrastructure of the Federal Reserve, global central banks, and financial institutions. For foreign central banks, this liquidity is crucial in managing exchange rates, stabilizing currencies during periods of volatility, and signaling financial strength.

Dumping Treasuries compromises this buffer. Once sold, the proceeds must be reinvested elsewhere—into assets that may be less liquid, less secure, or less globally accepted. Gold, for example, while valued for its intrinsic worth, cannot be rapidly deployed in FX markets. Euros and yen offer more stability than emerging market debt but lack the depth and neutrality of the dollar. Even holding cash creates reinvestment risk and opportunity cost.

Moreover, dumping Treasuries can undermine a central bank's credibility. Foreign reserves are intended to serve as a defense mechanism, not a weapon. Using them to exert geopolitical pressure or as a hedge against U.S. instability may be viewed by markets and ratings agencies as a loss of monetary discipline. Investors could reprice risk premia across the seller's sovereign debt, equities, and currency, compounding the costs of the decision.

7.2 No Viable Alternative: The TINA Problem

The dilemma intensifies because of the "TINA" constraint—*There Is No Alternative*. Despite its fiscal imbalances, the United States still provides the world's largest, most transparent, and most resilient bond market. No other sovereign issuer offers the same combination of yield, scale, convertibility, legal predictability, and institutional support.

The eurozone, while large, is fragmented and exposed to political frictions among member states. Chinese bonds lack full convertibility and transparency. Japanese bonds suffer from ultra-low yields and domestic monetary dominance. Emerging market assets are high-risk and

capacity-limited. Cryptocurrencies are far too volatile and politically unpalatable for sovereign reserve status.

Thus, any effort to offload U.S. Treasuries at scale must grapple with the absence of a truly equivalent asset. Sellers may find themselves in a diversification trap—reducing their reliance on the dollar at the cost of lowering their own portfolio resilience. This is especially problematic for export-driven economies like Japan, South Korea, and Germany, whose current account surpluses are traditionally recycled through safe, dollar-denominated instruments.

Even a partial shift into alternatives—such as commodity baskets, IMF Special Drawing Rights, or regional development bank bonds—would entail significant transition costs and coordination challenges. In practice, most sellers are locked into the U.S. Treasury ecosystem by the very structure of global finance.

7.3 Geopolitical Blowback and Domestic Instability

Beyond economic costs, foreign sellers risk severe geopolitical consequences. For nations that are strategic allies or major trading partners with the United States, a large-scale Treasury dump could be interpreted as an act of hostility. This could invite retaliatory measures including sanctions, capital controls, diplomatic isolation, or the reclassification of the dumping nation as a financial threat. In the case of adversarial states, such as China or Russia, the move could escalate tensions into open economic warfare, with downstream effects on trade, investment flows, and security alliances.

Internally, the consequences could be just as destabilizing. If foreign governments are seen to trigger a global financial shock by aggressively selling U.S. debt, their own populations may suffer the backlash. Currency depreciation, inflation, capital flight, and falling equity markets could rapidly erode political legitimacy—particularly in authoritarian or fragile regimes.

The domestic political class may also be divided. While hawkish factions might push for divestment as a gesture of sovereignty or resistance, technocratic institutions such as central banks and finance ministries may oppose the move, fearing its ripple effects. The decision to dump Treasuries could thus expose or exacerbate internal fractures within a regime.

Furthermore, any financial shock that follows a selloff would reduce the ability of the dumping nation to respond with effective monetary policy. If interest rates rise and reserves dwindle, central banks may lose their ability to stabilize their own economies—precisely the opposite of the strategic autonomy such divestment might hope to achieve.

In sum, the decision to sell U.S. Treasuries at scale carries significant costs for foreign holders. It risks liquidity, erodes reserve credibility, lacks realistic asset alternatives, and could provoke domestic and international backlash. While divestment may seem like an act of power or protest, it is more accurately understood as a high-risk gamble with no guaranteed upside. For most foreign actors, the Treasury dump dilemma is less about dominance and more about entrapment within a system too large and too interconnected to exit cleanly.

8. Systemic Financial Contagion

A mass liquidation of U.S. Treasuries by foreign holders would not remain confined to the bond and currency markets. Its shockwaves would rapidly transmit through the interconnected global financial system, generating cascading effects across banking, equity, commodity, and emerging market sectors. These interlocking domains rely on Treasury securities not only as assets but also as core infrastructure—used for collateral, benchmarking, and liquidity. When the foundational layer is destabilized, second- and third-order effects emerge, multiplying risk and reducing the ability of institutions and nations to respond independently. This section outlines how such contagion would unfold across three critical fronts: global collateral chains, equity and commodity markets, and the vulnerable economies of the developing world.

8.1 Collateral Collapse in Global Banking

In the global banking system, U.S. Treasuries function not merely as investments but as essential collateral. They are widely used in repurchase (repo) markets, derivative margining, central bank operations, and interbank lending. Their reliability, liquidity, and zero-risk weighting under Basel standards make them the backbone of modern financial plumbing.

When a rapid selloff of Treasuries occurs, prices fall and yields rise. The result is a devaluation of posted collateral. Banks that pledged Treasuries to secure short-term borrowing may suddenly face margin calls as their collateral is marked down. Lenders may demand additional collateral or raise haircuts, creating a self-reinforcing liquidity squeeze. This is particularly dangerous for systemically important financial institutions (SIFIs) and global investment banks that rely heavily on repo funding.

This collateral degradation spreads contagiously: when one counterparty defaults or is perceived to be under stress, risk aversion spreads across the network. Interbank lending dries up. Credit default swap spreads widen. The architecture of global finance begins to seize up—not because assets are worthless, but because they are no longer trusted or stable enough to function as collateral.

Compounding the problem is the fact that many financial models and stress tests assume Treasury prices will rise during crises, not fall. A reversal of this assumption breaks conventional risk modeling, exposing vulnerabilities in institutions that had counted on Treasuries to hedge other positions. What begins as a sovereign selloff becomes a systemic liquidity and trust crisis.

8.2 Equity Market Drawdowns and Flight to Commodities

As Treasury yields spike, the effects spill over into equity markets through several mechanisms. First, higher risk-free rates reduce the present value of future corporate earnings, leading to sharp downward repricing of stocks—especially growth stocks with long-duration cash flows. Second, rising yields increase borrowing costs for companies, tightening margins and dampening investment. Third, financial volatility erodes investor confidence, triggering selloffs and portfolio rebalancing.

Institutional investors may be forced to liquidate equities to cover bond-related losses or meet redemption requests. This dynamic can lead to forced selling and price cascades, particularly in highly liquid index funds and ETFs. Retail investors, seeing rapid declines in their portfolios, may exit in panic, accelerating the downturn.

At the same time, a classic “flight to real assets” may unfold. Investors lose faith in fiat-denominated instruments and rotate into commodities—especially gold, silver, oil, and agricultural staples. Prices of these assets spike as they are perceived to retain intrinsic value amid monetary instability. While some of this shift may hedge against currency devaluation, it also introduces input cost inflation across industrial sectors, further damaging corporate earnings and stoking consumer price volatility.

In this climate, volatility indexes surge, market-making deteriorates, and regulatory circuit breakers may be triggered repeatedly. The equity selloff becomes not just a reaction to bond stress but a mechanism for transmitting and amplifying systemic fear.

8.3 Emerging Market Fallout and Capital Flight

Emerging markets are often the first casualties in global financial contagions, and this scenario would be no exception. Many developing nations rely on stable U.S. Treasury markets to anchor their own financial systems. Their central banks hold Treasuries as reserves, and their currencies are informally pegged or benchmarked against the dollar. The ripple effects from a Treasury collapse would hit them along several axes simultaneously.

First, capital flight would accelerate. Investors seeking safety would pull funds from emerging market equities, bonds, and bank accounts, converting local currency holdings into dollars—despite the paradoxical instability of the dollar. This exodus would put downward pressure on local currencies, triggering inflation, higher import costs, and increased debt-servicing burdens for countries with dollar-denominated liabilities.

Second, emerging market sovereigns and corporations that rely on issuing debt in international markets would face skyrocketing borrowing costs. With global investors risk-off and benchmark yields elevated, risk spreads widen dramatically. Many nations could be priced out of capital markets entirely, leading to funding crises or forced austerity.

Third, political stability would be tested. Inflation, unemployment, and reduced foreign direct investment can rapidly undermine fragile governments. Social unrest, capital controls, and even defaults become plausible in the most vulnerable regions. For countries already carrying high debt loads or structural trade imbalances, the Treasury shock could be the final straw.

Global institutions like the IMF and World Bank might be forced into triage mode, providing emergency lines of credit and attempting to coordinate debt relief. But the scale and simultaneity of the shock would stretch even these mechanisms. The result would be a synchronized wave of emerging market distress, dragging down global growth and extending the crisis duration well beyond its financial origins.

In total, the systemic contagion unleashed by a $9 trillion Treasury dump would spread far beyond its point of origin. It would undermine the function of collateral in global banking, incinerate equity market valuations, trigger speculative surges in commodities, and destabilize the economic foundations of the developing world. This is not merely a bond crisis. It is a multi-domain failure of confidence, connectivity, and coordination across the global financial system.

9. Historical Analogs and Precedents

While the full-scale foreign liquidation of U.S. Treasuries remains a hypothetical extreme, financial history offers several analogs that help us understand how asset markets, currencies, and governments have responded to sudden shifts in capital flows and investor behavior. These episodes, while smaller in scope or narrower in geography, provide insight into mechanisms of contagion, policy response limits, and the fragility of financial confidence. By examining the 2013 Taper Tantrum, the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis, and various cases of coordinated disinvestment threats, we can better contextualize the stakes of the simulated Treasury dump and identify points of failure that may repeat on a larger scale.

9.1 The Taper Tantrum (2013)

In May 2013, the Federal Reserve signaled that it would begin reducing the pace of its asset purchases—a move dubbed the "taper." Though no actual sales occurred at the time, the mere suggestion that quantitative easing would slow sent shockwaves through global markets. The 10-year Treasury yield rose by over 100 basis points in a matter of weeks, equity markets wobbled, and capital began fleeing emerging markets.

The Taper Tantrum revealed the extraordinary sensitivity of global capital flows to changes in U.S. monetary expectations. Countries with large external debts, current account deficits, or heavy foreign investment—such as India, Indonesia, Brazil, and Turkey—saw their currencies depreciate rapidly, forcing their central banks to hike interest rates to defend against further outflows.

This episode is instructive for two reasons. First, it underscores the importance of forward guidance and perception management by central banks. Second, it shows how even incremental, well-telegraphed policy shifts can create acute volatility when markets are dependent on U.S. liquidity. In contrast, a forced Treasury dump would be neither incremental nor well-telegraphed—suggesting much more violent repricing and dislocation.

9.2 Asian Financial Crisis (1997)

The Asian Financial Crisis began in Thailand with the collapse of the Thai baht, but quickly spread to Indonesia, South Korea, Malaysia, and beyond. The underlying cause was a sudden stop in capital inflows, followed by rapid capital flight and speculative attacks on currencies. Many of the affected countries had accumulated large foreign-denominated debts, pegged their currencies to the U.S. dollar, and relied on strong export demand.

As capital exited, exchange rates collapsed, domestic banks failed, and real economies contracted sharply. What had once been considered fast-growing "Asian Tigers" became crisis zones overnight. The IMF intervened with massive rescue packages, often conditional on harsh austerity measures.

This crisis is relevant because it demonstrates how capital flight and reserve inadequacy can trigger systemic collapse in interconnected economies. In a global Treasury dump scenario, emerging markets could face similar consequences—especially if their reserves were tied up in depreciating Treasuries and their currencies were exposed to dollar volatility. Moreover, the Asian crisis illustrates how contagion—both financial and psychological—can leap across borders even in the absence of direct economic ties.

9.3 Lessons from Coordinated Disinvestment Threats

There have been past episodes—though never at the scale modeled here—where foreign governments have signaled or initiated reductions in U.S. debt holdings for strategic or political reasons. China has occasionally threatened to "weaponize" its Treasury holdings, particularly during periods of trade tension. Russia has significantly reduced its U.S. Treasury exposure over the past decade, citing de-dollarization and sanctions resistance.

While none of these actions has triggered a crisis, they highlight the growing awareness among rival powers of the financial leverage embedded in reserve portfolios. In 2018, China's public suggestion that it might reduce Treasury purchases contributed to brief selloffs and elevated volatility in the bond market. However, each time, market participants largely assumed such actions would be self-defeating for the sellers—reinforcing the idea of "mutually assured disruption."

The key takeaway is that financial weaponization is credible but constrained. While disinvestment threats may function as a form of psychological or political pressure, executing them at scale risks damaging the sender's own economy, reserve flexibility, and currency stability. These past episodes offer a precedent not for a full-scale liquidation, but for the logic behind its deterrence: that the pain would be shared—perhaps unequally, but significantly—by all participants.

In sum, history reveals that confidence is often more fragile than fundamentals, and that markets respond violently to changes in perceived support for key financial instruments. The lessons of 2013 and 1997, along with ongoing geopolitical signaling, point to the immense challenge of managing coordinated or uncoordinated disinvestment in a system built on trust, liquidity, and global interdependence. The Treasury dump scenario thus reflects not only a hypothetical financial collapse, but an echo of past imbalances pushed to their logical conclusion.

10. Strategic Lessons and Policy Implications

The prospect of a global foreign Treasury divestment is not merely a theoretical risk—it is a stress test for the underlying architecture of the international monetary system. While the likelihood of a fully coordinated liquidation remains low, the severity of its consequences compels policymakers to prepare proactive strategies that address fiscal vulnerabilities, institutional dependencies, and systemic overconcentration. A Treasury dump scenario reveals not only financial fragility but also geopolitical asymmetries and policy design flaws. This section

synthesizes forward-looking recommendations for the United States and the broader international community, aimed at reinforcing resilience in the face of such a crisis.

10.1 Strengthening U.S. Fiscal Discipline

At the core of the Treasury dump scenario lies a persistent structural weakness: the United States' long-standing fiscal imbalance. The national debt has surpassed $30 trillion, with deficits projected to grow over the coming decades due to entitlement spending, military budgets, and interest obligations. As debt-to-GDP ratios rise and debt servicing costs consume larger portions of the federal budget, investor confidence in U.S. fiscal sustainability may erode—especially in the absence of credible consolidation efforts.

To address this, U.S. policymakers must prioritize long-term fiscal reform over short-term political expediency. This includes:

- Restructuring entitlement programs to ensure solvency.
- Reducing structural deficits through bipartisan tax and spending reforms.
- Implementing binding fiscal rules or medium-term frameworks that restore credibility.

By reinforcing the perception that the U.S. is committed to honoring its obligations without inflationary finance or uncontrolled borrowing, the federal government can reduce the incentive for foreign holders to exit Treasury markets in a panic or protest. Fiscal discipline is not just a matter of domestic governance—it is a foundational input to global financial stability.

10.2 Reshoring Demand: Domestic Absorption of Debt

A key vulnerability exposed in this scenario is external reliance: the United States depends heavily on foreign entities to finance its borrowing needs. This concentration of exposure empowers foreign governments to influence—or destabilize—the U.S. economy through financial actions. To counter this, the Treasury and Federal Reserve should encourage a greater share of U.S. debt to be held domestically.

This can be achieved through several policy levers:

- Expanding access to Treasury securities among retail investors via direct purchase programs, digital bond platforms, and tax incentives.
- Encouraging U.S. pension funds, insurance companies, and asset managers to increase their Treasury allocations, especially in long-dated securities.

- Leveraging public trust funds, like Social Security and state retirement systems, as stable domestic holders.

In addition, financial literacy campaigns and institutional innovations—such as Treasury-linked savings products for low-income households—can broaden the domestic investor base. A more internalized debt ecosystem makes the U.S. less vulnerable to sudden foreign selloffs, while reinforcing democratic alignment between citizens and fiscal policy outcomes.

10.3 Diversifying Global Reserve Architecture

The Treasury dump scenario also reveals the fragility of a unipolar reserve system. The U.S. dollar, while dominant, is under growing scrutiny due to weaponization risks, unilateral sanctions, and concerns about inflationary dilution. Foreign governments' heavy concentration in U.S. assets creates a single point of failure in global reserves. The solution is not to collapse dollar dominance overnight, but to gradually diversify the reserve ecosystem.

Policy directions for this diversification include:

- Expanding the use and convertibility of Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) issued by the International Monetary Fund, especially for emerging market reserve pools.
- Encouraging regional reserve cooperation mechanisms (e.g., ASEAN+3 Chiang Mai Initiative, Latin American Reserve Fund) to reduce dependence on U.S.-centric assets.
- Promoting multilateral infrastructure bonds, climate-linked securities, and commodity-backed instruments as alternative reserve stores.
- Supporting transparency and reforms in eurozone and Asian bond markets to make them more attractive as reserve anchors.

This diversification serves multiple goals. It reduces the systemic risk of a U.S.-centric shock, provides countries with better alignment between reserves and strategic interests, and creates a more balanced and resilient international financial order. The U.S., while it may lose some hegemonic leverage, benefits from a more stable and predictable environment in which no single actor holds disproportionate retaliatory power.

In summary, the strategic lesson from simulating a $9.355 trillion Treasury dump is that global financial stability is inseparable from domestic prudence, market structure, and international coordination. The United States must shore up its fiscal trajectory and broaden its domestic investor base, while the world must work collectively to evolve beyond overdependence on any

single reserve asset. Failing to act on these insights could turn a hypothetical crisis into a real and irreversible breakdown of the financial order.

11. Conclusion

The simulation of a full-scale foreign liquidation of U.S. Treasury securities is not merely a financial modeling exercise—it is a lens through which we can examine the structural fault lines of a highly interconnected global system. The dollar-centric financial order has long benefited from stability, trust, and inertia. But these same features, when disrupted, become sources of fragility. The very architecture that enables cheap U.S. borrowing and global monetary coordination is also one that, if ruptured, threatens systemic contagion, geopolitical escalation, and economic contraction. The following three strategic conclusions emerge from this simulation.

11.1 Mutually Assured Disruption as Deterrent

The Treasury dump scenario underscores a paradox of financial interdependence: the immense power to destabilize is balanced by the cost of doing so. For foreign holders, especially large sovereigns like China or Japan, dumping Treasuries would trigger a chain reaction that harms their own currencies, reserves, trade balances, and domestic financial stability. For the United States, the same selloff would erode fiscal sustainability, trigger inflation, and test the Federal Reserve's credibility.

This mutual vulnerability functions as a deterrent—mutually assured disruption, not unlike nuclear deterrence in geopolitics. As long as all parties believe that the act of destabilization would be more painful than beneficial, the system holds. This dynamic reinforces restraint but is itself brittle. If trust erodes, if miscommunication escalates, or if political pressures override economic logic, the balance can quickly unravel. Policymakers must therefore recognize that fragility masquerading as stability is no longer acceptable in a world of high-speed financial flows and strategic realignments.

11.2 Rethinking Financial Interdependence

The simulation makes clear that global finance is deeply asymmetrical. The United States enjoys an "exorbitant privilege" by issuing the dominant reserve currency and attracting foreign capital on favorable terms. Meanwhile, many other countries face a lack of alternatives when

deploying their reserves, making them vulnerable to U.S. domestic policy decisions, sanctions regimes, and macroeconomic cycles.

A rethinking of financial interdependence is overdue. For the United States, this means acknowledging that overreliance on foreign capital is a strategic liability, not just an economic convenience. It implies reinforcing domestic fiscal discipline, broadening internal demand for debt, and treating the Treasury market as a shared public utility rather than a bottomless credit card.

For the rest of the world, rethinking interdependence means preparing for autonomy within cooperation. This entails building resilient domestic financial systems, reducing dollar dependency for trade and reserves, and designing institutions that can mitigate volatility without relying on a single issuer. The goal is not isolation, but distributed sovereignty within a transparent framework—one that limits the capacity of any one actor to shock the entire system.

11.3 Toward a Post-Dollar Multipolar Reserve System

Ultimately, the simulation points toward a structural endpoint: the slow emergence of a multipolar reserve system. While the dollar will likely remain dominant for the foreseeable future, its uncontested supremacy is no longer guaranteed. The euro, the yuan, regional reserve pools, and even non-sovereign instruments like IMF Special Drawing Rights or commodity-linked reserves may begin to play larger roles in global portfolios.

A multipolar system would offer redundancy and balance. Countries could diversify risk, reduce vulnerability to single-point failures, and engage in cooperative currency arrangements without sacrificing national security or monetary autonomy. Transitioning to such a system, however, requires political will, institutional innovation, and time. It also requires the United States to adapt to a new reality in which financial hegemony must be earned, not assumed.

If taken seriously, the Treasury dump simulation is not just a warning—it is a catalyst. It invites a new round of global dialogue on how to future-proof the financial system before an unthinkable scenario becomes inevitable. The next crisis will not wait for consensus. The time to prepare is now.

12. References

This section compiles key sources referenced throughout the simulation, analysis, and policy recommendations related to a hypothetical $9.355 trillion foreign Treasury divestment. It includes official datasets, institutional research, historical precedent studies, and academic literature relevant to capital flows, sovereign debt dynamics, and systemic financial risk. All sources listed here are publicly accessible and reflect the most reliable data and interpretations available as of 2025–2026.

12.1 Official U.S. Government Data and Reports

- U.S. Department of the Treasury – *Major Foreign Holders of Treasury Securities (TIC Data)*
  Treasury International Capital (TIC) System, Table 5
  https://home.treasury.gov/data/treasury-international-capital-tic-system
- Joint Economic Committee – *Monthly Debt Update: January 2026*
  U.S. Congress
  https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/
- Federal Reserve Board – *Selected Assets and Liabilities of Large Commercial Banks in the United States*
  H.8 and H.4.1 Statistical Releases
  https://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/
- Congressional Budget Office – *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2025 to 2035*
  https://www.cbo.gov/publication/58946

12.2 Historical Financial Events and Case Studies

- Bernanke, Ben S. (2013). *The Federal Reserve and the Financial Crisis*
  Brookings Institution Lectures
- Eichengreen, Barry & Hausmann, Ricardo (1999). *Exchange Rates and Financial Fragility*
  NBER Working Paper No. 7418
- Radelet, Steven & Sachs, Jeffrey (1998). *The Onset of the East Asian Financial Crisis*
  NBER Working Paper No. 6680

- Rey, Hélène (2013). *Dilemma not Trilemma: The Global Financial Cycle and Monetary Policy Independence*
  Proceedings – Jackson Hole Economic Symposium

12.3 Global Institutions and Reserve Architecture

- International Monetary Fund (IMF) – *Composition of Foreign Exchange Reserves (COFER)*
  https://data.imf.org/
- Bank for International Settlements (BIS) – *Triennial Central Bank Survey 2022: Global Foreign Exchange Turnover*
  https://www.bis.org/statistics/rpfx22.htm
- World Bank – *Global Economic Prospects: 2025*
  https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-economic-prospects

---

12.4 Academic and Policy Literature on Sovereign Debt and Currency Dynamics

- Krugman, Paul (1979). *A Model of Balance-of-Payments Crises*
  Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 11(3): 311–325
- Obstfeld, Maurice (1996). *Models of Currency Crises with Self-Fulfilling Features*
  European Economic Review, 40(3-5): 1037–1047
- Rogoff, Kenneth (2020). *The Case for a Global Currency Basket*
  Project Syndicate / Harvard University
- Gopinath, Gita & Stein, Jeremy (2021). *Banking, Trade, and the Making of a Dominant Currency*
  Quarterly Journal of Economics, 136(2): 783–830

12.5 Relevant Commentary and Simulation Inspiration

- Rogoff, Kenneth (2022). *"The Dollar's Fragile Privilege."*
  Foreign Affairs, Council on Foreign Relations
- BIS Bulletin No. 56 (2023). *Resilience and Fragility in Sovereign Bond Markets*
  Bank for International Settlements

- Goldman Sachs Global Macro Research (2024). *Flight to Liquidity: What Happens if Treasuries Sell Off?*
- Peterson Institute for International Economics (2025). *Is Treasury Market Liquidity a National Security Issue?*

The author has published ~ 5,000 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.